



October 7, 2021

Dear President Biden and Members of Congress,

The Fair Start Movement, a nonprofit organization that advocates for smaller, more equitable, and more sustainable families, applauds President Biden for the recently signed Executive Order on Climate-Related Financial Risk. The order lays out steps toward requiring climate change disclosure by corporations and toward a permanent disclosure framework for environmental, social, and governance risks. We also applaud Congress for comparable attempts to pass legislation to require ESG due diligence and disclosure.

Accounting for the Multiplier of Growth and Telling the Truth

We hope the president and Congress will consider issuing an additional executive order and aligned legislation clarifying that ESG disclosures must include specific disclosures regarding policies and advocacy that promote unsustainable population growth. Family planning policies, the population growth and reduction these policies dictate, and their unique and multifaceted impact on social and ecological crises are the largest drivers of the Anthropocene and anthropogenic climate change.

Failure to account for the multiplying impact of population growth on previously unknown factors like greenhouse gas emissions is how we arrived at the crises that drive the need for an ESG disclosure framework. **Put simply, that framework must address volatility in the underlying multiplier — population — or it will be misleading and ineffective. We simply need to know what role particular institutions - for profit and nonprofit- played and will play in the greatest and most fundamental driver of the crises the ESG framework was meant to address.** For example, any claim past, present or future, using the term “sustainable” that did not also account for the impact of growth on that claim would have been misleading, and potentially forestalled policy reforms with the largest impact - by far¹ - on the climate and dozens of related problems.

Let’s not make the same mistake again. Given that the ESG framework is largely driven by the climate crisis, which is fundamentally a crisis of intergenerational justice, that is where we should start.

¹ See <https://yaleclimateconnections.org/2019/03/how-family-size-shapes-your-carbon-footprint/>

Growth has the greatest exacerbating impact on the climate and many other ecosocial crises,² period. And for decades, many firms have pushed for the unsustainable pronatal policies that created the ecosocial crises we now face because those policies would ensure growing consumer demand, cheap labor markets, and larger tax bases.³ Corporations profited by converting the American promise of functional town halls, where each voice mattered, into crowded shopping malls that at bottom drive the crises the ESG framework is meant to address. Without being called to task in the ESG disclosure framework, they will push women to have more and more children,⁴ relegating untold numbers to a degraded ecological future with no guaranteed levels of resilience or resource.

These firms benefited by imposing costs like that on others, and at the most fundamental level, by ensuring that children would be born into impoverished conditions, with a massive and growing gap between rich and poor, and in large and unsustainable families, with no regard for the impact on our democracy.

To be clear:

1. Prior claims by firms regarding sustainability were blatantly misleading because they intentionally omitted the impact of growth. Companies were making money through increased consumer demand and cheap labor markets with one hand while distracting consumers with greenwashed claims about relatively ineffective sustainability changes to processes like product design with the other. In doing this, corporations thereby forestalled crucial and fundamental family policy changes⁵ that could have mitigated the climate and other crises. In many cases, they partnered with and were assisted by nonprofits, media, and other sectors of civil society that furthered a taboo around public discussions of family planning and population growth. The costs of this deception are enormous.⁶
2. Current claims, and the reporting under the ESG framework, will also be misleading (and the framework will be ineffective) for the same reasons⁷ and because they will fail to

² See Hamity M, Dillard C, Bexell SM, Graff-Hughey C. A Human Rights Approach to Planning Families. *Social Change*. 2019;49(3):469-492. doi:10.1177/0049085719863894; see also <https://faunalytics.org/why-population-growth-is-animal-enemy-1/>

³ See <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2017/12/pro-natalism/547493/>

⁴ See

<https://www.houstonchronicle.com/politics/article/The-money-behind-the-politics-These-companies-16444025.php>

⁵ See

<http://blogs.luc.edu/lawjournal/2020/04/how-subsidizing-delayed-parenthood-will-let-children-lead-the-way-to-a-fairer-world/>

⁶ See https://www.biologicaldiversity.org/programs/population_and_sustainability/climate/

⁷ See

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/152bx6MINEnSqUjuxIq9M_cryoy_IFSL3MRCcvY1qSbA/viewform?edit_requested=true

account for the massive volatility in impact due to current family planning policies, with outcomes dependent on population projections that vary by billions of people in the decades to come.⁸

This clarification of the ESG framework, which is necessary to maximize the likelihood of meeting the executive order's "target of a net-zero emissions economy by no later than 2050," will more fully inform the public about the underlying driver and multiplier of the climate and other ESG crises. It's also necessary if we're to help civil society transition to intergenerational or birth ecosocial equity — and thereby help the vast majority of persons: those who will live in the future⁹ — by simply telling the truth about the impact of our past, present, and future family planning policies.

Having a child is the most publicly impactful thing most people ever do. Moreover, given that the climate crisis is a key reason for an ESG disclosure framework, and that crisis is primarily intergenerational in nature, the framework must address the key aspect of intergenerational justice: the act of having children.¹⁰ Family planning and population policies are not about numbers as much as they are about people, inextricably intertwined in everything we do. It is who we are, or the we in "We the People," and the multiplying impact our existence has on foundational priorities like our national security.¹¹

Many corporations have benefited and imposed significant costs on others through the promotion of pronatal family planning policies, pretending all the while to engage in ecologically beneficial measures that they knew were undone by the upstream population growth and its corresponding increased demand for products. This happened simultaneously with the mass greenwashing by industries that has driven the need for an ESG disclosure framework.¹²

And it included massive media corporations blatantly violating ethical standards of journalism by misreporting on effective solutions to the climate and related crises, and encouraging irresponsible and unsustainable family planning in ways that benefited their advertisers and because of other more direct financial incentives.¹³

These same pronatal policies also ensure massive ESG outcome volatility that will make many disclosures under the current ESG framework misleading because they have failed to support the precautionary steps (i.e., family planning policies and population reduction) that such volatility

⁸ See Hamity, *supra*.

⁹ See Carter Dillard, *Justice as a Fair Start in Life* (Eliva 2021, forthcoming).

¹⁰ See <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/justice-intergenerational/>

¹¹ See <https://www.wilsoncenter.org/event/national-security-and-the-threat-climate-change>

¹² See

<https://fortune.com/2021/04/11/greenwashing-esg-businesses-corporations-climate-change/>

¹³ See <https://www.refinery29.com/en-gb/what-is-pronatalism;>

[https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2017/12/pro-natalism/547493/;](https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2017/12/pro-natalism/547493/)

<https://www.businessinsider.com/fossil-fuel-companies-spend-millions-to-promote-individual-responsibility-2021-3>

requires.¹⁴ Moreover, these policies have been, on balance, completely unjust and unsustainable, exacerbating potentially explosive social inequities,¹⁵ degrading our democracy in favor of economic growth,¹⁶ and ensuring the ecocide we are witnessing today. This is painfully obvious when we examine the role poor family planning and population growth — and the overcrowding, poor public health, inequity, and antisocial behaviors they created — have played in exacerbating the spread and impact of Covid-19.¹⁷ That state of affairs will also drive the next pandemic as we continue to degrade our ecologies. Moreover, women who were pushed to have children under the growth paradigm enabled by the UN’s modeling – and have children despite the risks of Covid-19 – are dying in massively disproportionate numbers.¹⁸ We need to hold those who enabled this accountable.

To ensure justice, enable all to admit their mistakes, and guarantee the correct payment of costs, we need to understand the historic, current, and future roles of unsustainable family planning policies in determining ESG outcomes.

Modifying the ESG Disclosure Framework

Specifically, in keeping with the executive order’s mandate to “advance consistent, clear, intelligible, comparable, and accurate disclosure of climate-related financial risk,” we are asking to modify the overarching ESG disclosure framework to ensure disclosures of 1) all past policies and advocacy regarding the fundamental multiplier of family planning/population growth, 2) the impact of those policies and advocacy on the crises the ESG disclosure framework is meant to address, and 3) how these policies and advocacy are being changed — if at all — to address the ESG crises they drive. The disclosures should include even tacit support for status-quo pronatal policies like many family benefit packages, which would have aligned with companies (and some nonprofits and other civil society organizations) profiting from disastrous upstream population growth while they touted the greenwashed downstream measures that growth was undoing.

This modified framework should also 4) specifically require disclosure of the most recent corporate pronatal policies and advocacy meant to push women — in the middle of climate, pandemic, and other related ecological crises — to have more children in reaction to the “baby bust” crisis many of these companies manufactured in the media. In order to “account for and address disparate impacts [of climate-related financial risk] on disadvantaged communities and

¹⁴ See <https://www.nap.edu/read/9828/chapter/9>

¹⁵ See

<https://nymag.com/intelligencer/2021/07/will-the-great-wealth-transfer-spark-a-millennial-civil-war.html>

¹⁶ See <https://fairstartmovement.org/human-rights-democracy/>

¹⁷ See <https://fairstartmovement.org/covid-19-and-family-planning-get-the-facts/>

¹⁸ See

<https://www.wcpo.com/news/coronavirus/covid-vaccine/august-deadliest-month-for-pregnant-patients-with-covid-19-ohio-officials-urge-vaccination>

communities of color,”¹⁹ it is important to know who was supporting prenatal policies and profiting from unsustainable growth that exploited children as mere economic inputs rather than developing them as effective members of the politically liberating, and sustainable, democracies meant to precede and control economies. These same policies and advocacy further entrenched, and in many cases intentionally exacerbated, the one-tenth wealth gap between black and white children that was inherited from slavery. This framework should also include 5) disclosure of policies and advocacy meant to apply abroad, including in the Peoples’ Republic of China, where U.S. companies have undercut our national interests, human rights and democracy, and environmentalism globally by profiting from a despotic regime.

We will be calling on the nonprofit and other civil society sectors to join this effort, and to lead by example by themselves disclosing their past policies and plans for change. Many are already changing course, abandoning the moral insanity of models that push parents, driven by poor policies, to bring unlimited numbers of new children into already severely degraded ecologies, with no minimum levels of care, development, equity, or resilience ensured for those children.

Who We Will Be as the Most Important Factor

Studies have repeatedly shown that reducing population growth through family planning is the most effective means of mitigating climate change and its impacts.²⁰ A study by Oregon State University statisticians found that the greenhouse gas impact of having an additional child in the U.S. is almost 20 times greater than the savings from a lifetime of recycling, reducing, and reusing. They also found that each child born in the U.S. will add about 9,441 metric tons of carbon dioxide to the carbon legacy of an average parent.²¹ The study concludes, “[c]learly, the potential savings from reduced reproduction are huge compared to the savings that can be achieved by changes in lifestyle.”

These facts are indisputable:

¹⁹ See

<https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-actions/2021/05/20/executive-order-on-climate-related-financial-risk/>

²⁰ See Seth Wynes and Kimberly A Nicholas, *The climate mitigation gap: education and government recommendations miss the most effective individual actions*. 12 ENVIRON. RES. LETT 7. (2017); see also, *The four lifestyle choices that most reduce your carbon footprint*, Published 12 July 2017, at <https://www.lunduniversity.lu.se/article/four-lifestyle-choices-most-reduce-your-carbon-footprint>; Guillebaud, John, and Pip Hayes. *Population growth and climate change*. BMJ 2008; 337; a576; Rosnick, David, *The Consequences of Increased Population Growth for Climate Change*. Center for Economic and Policy Research (2014). <http://cepr.net/documents/Climate-population-2014-12.pdf>; *Population Matters Report: Population key to controlling climate change* (2017). <https://www.populationmatters.org/report-population-key-controlling-climate-change>

²¹ See Paul A. Murtaugh & Michael G. Schlax, *Reproduction and the Carbon Legacies of Individuals*, 19 GLOBAL ENVTL. CHANGE 14, 18 (2009).

The family planning policy and population drivers are the fundamental cause of the anthropogenic crises that ESG due diligence and disclosures are meant to address, and they have the greatest long-term impact on the crises going forward through sustained multiplication of impact. Additionally, ESG disclosures are inherently misleading if they do not include analyses of the multiplying factor of family planning policies and population growth/reduction, and the impact on projected outcomes. Finally, greenwashing sustainability and other claims by many corporations (and certain nonprofits that support them) have been blatantly false and misleading because they have omitted the impact of their own pro-growth policies and, as such, have forestalled effective policy reform.

Population growth is not sustainable, and policies that push it are, according to Nobel Laureate Steven Chu, part of an economic Ponzi scheme forcing costs, and a climate deficit, on future generations.²² Yet policies to stabilize the world at an optimal population range have been forestalled, in part, by outright deception by for-profit and nonprofits that have focused attention on distracting downstream, temporary, and localized solutions to environmental and others ESG crises, while knowingly and simultaneously undoing those solutions through the upstream population growth policies that were benefiting those entities by creating revenue, political capital, corporate donations, etc.

This scheme is rampant in greenwashed sectors of the economy, where auto producers, alternative energy markets, and “sustainable” home builders push dubious products while simultaneously supporting pronatal policies that promote having as many children as possible, thereby undoing any gains their products might have created.²³

This scheme hurts future generations in ways that throw into question the legitimacy of our political system and that will require compensation for future generations and novel methods of ensuring it.²⁴ The import of this should be clear as we recognize that the climate crisis represents

²² See The World Economy Is A Pyramid Scheme, Steven Chu Says, Jeff McMahon, April 5th, 2019, at <https://www.forbes.com/sites/jeffmcmahon/2019/04/05/the-world-economy-is-a-pyramid-scheme-steven-chu-says/?sh=f2bdcb4f1782>.

²³ It is also rampant in the animal protection community, where plant-based producers and their advertisers tout the impact of their products in reducing animal suffering, knowing that their support of pro-growth policies that increase base demand will cause far more animal suffering in the long term.

²⁴ See A TRUE INDEPENDENCE DAY? WATCH FAIR START IN ACTION, Ashley Berke, July 6, 2021, at <https://fairstartmovement.org/a-true-independence-day-watch-fair-start-in-action/>; <https://fairstartmovement.org/worried-about-having-kids-in-the-climate-crisis-your-human-rights-were-violated-fight-back/>

a grave threat to national security,²⁵ one that was created in part by our fellow citizens who enriched themselves by placing severe cost burdens on others.

All environmental progress to date in every sector is being undone by a human-driven climate crisis, the multiplying factor of which was completely foreseen and projected, and its impact exacerbated by pro-growth policies that continue.²⁶ And the impact is not limited to the climate crisis: It fundamentally drives dozens of other crises, including the threat and impact of global pandemics, massive economic inequities, and degrading democracies. Any ESG framework that does not account for this fundamental scheme will invite further deception and exacerbate these crises.

This goes beyond emissions. Population growth, the underlying driver of the climate crisis, is a double-edged sword. Poor family planning has fundamentally degraded what could have been the robust resilience of the people who will inhabit a future ecologically degraded by that same growth. This includes their level of welfare and health at birth and beyond, their equity relative to one another, and their cooperative role in effective democratic communities that will have to address the crises. These issues impact the environment and how we fundamentally respond to it. These issues also implicate the core of democracy because climate change will impact the majority of Americans — those who will live in the future — against their will and interests. Little else should be as offensive to our values.

Disclosures about the underlying driver of the crises an ESG framework aims to address are vital. The public deserves to know who played what role in greenwashing away the impact of the largest driver of the crisis. They deserve to understand who benefited by externalizing costs and otherwise driving the anthropogenic impacts — in the worst and most multifaceted way possible — so that justice can be served and future generations can be best prepared, and thereby most fairly and effectively compensated, for the harm we have caused them.²⁷

This move to liberate future generations through ecosocial birth equity is analogous to the LGBTQ+ movement, or the ongoing work to establish equality and inclusion for a vulnerable community whose relative self-determination is being unjustly prevented. Future generations have rights that are being violated,²⁸ including their own right to found a family in conditions

²⁵ See Deputy Defense Secretary Kathleen Hicks Explains How Climate Change Threatens National Security, Joan Michelson, June 27, 2021, at <https://www.forbes.com/sites/joanmichelson2/2021/06/27/deputy-defense-secretary-kathleen-hicks-explains-how-climate-change-threatens-national-security/?sh=6e8b79961f5b>.

²⁶ See FAIR START MOVEMENT: THE UNITE AMERICA CAMPAIGN, Ashley Berke, January 20, 2021, at <https://fairstartmovement.org/the-having-kids-unite-america-campaign/>

²⁷ See Dillard, *supra*.

²⁸ NEW GENERATIONS ARE CHANGING THE WAY WE PLAN FAMILIES AND ARE DEMANDING FAIR START. TAKE ACTION, Guest Contributor, May 24, 2020, at <https://fairstartmovement.org/new-generations-are-changing-the-way-we-plan-families-and-are-demanding-fair-start-take-action/>.

that would comply with the United Nations' Convention on the Rights of the Child and to live free from the harmful power of others.

The problem's urgency cannot be overstated when "every week, an extra 1.5 million people need food and somewhere to live," which "amounts to a huge new city each week, somewhere, which destroys wildlife habitats and augments world fossil fuel consumption."²⁹ The calculus is simple: Larger populations in the developed world consume more, and as consumption increases, so do carbon emissions, which in turn results in intensified climate change^{30 31} and environmental degradation that is then felt most acutely by the poor.³² As the IPCC's 4th Assessment Report notes: "At the global scale, declining carbon and energy intensities have been unable to offset income effects and population growth and, consequently, carbon emissions have risen."

It is no wonder, then, that family planning interventions, such as having fewer children, have been shown to be the most effective way to simultaneously protect the world's environment and improve human well-being.^{33 34} Indeed, managing population growth has actually proven more feasible than seeking to reduce consumption and emissions.³⁵ This has led civil society organizations such as the Fair Start Movement to enlist celebrities to help model better family

²⁹ See Guillebaud, John, and Pip Hayes. "Population growth and climate change." *BMJ* 2008; 337; a576.

³⁰ See Rosnick, David. "The Consequences of Increased Population Growth for Climate Change." Center for Economic and Policy Research (2014).
<http://cepr.net/documents/Climate-population-2014-12.pdf>

³¹ See Population Matters Report: Population key to controlling climate change (2017).
<https://www.populationmatters.org/report-population-key-controlling-climate-change/>

³² For a discussion of the broader resource trade-offs and philosophical questions implicated by large families of means, see Rachels (note 7), articulating the "Famine Relief Argument against Having Children," where one "should immunize, feed and clothe impoverished children who already exist rather than spend hundreds of thousands of dollars on having one child of our own."

³³ Seth Wynes and Kimberly A Nicholas (2017). "The climate mitigation gap: education and government recommendations miss the most effective individual actions." *Environ. Res. Lett.* **12** 074024.

³⁴ Almost every United Nations Sustainable Development Goal fundamentally relies upon some form of family planning, and would benefit from improvements thereto. For a succinct summary of the goals see Council on Foundations, Getting Started With the Sustainable Development Goals. (2015)

<http://www.cof.org/content/sustainable-development-goals-what-funders-need-know>.

³⁵ See Frederick A. B. Meyerson, "Population Growth Is Easier to Manage than Per-Capita Emissions," Population and Climate roundtable discussion held by the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, January 17, 2008.

planning.³⁶ But these small moves cannot replace a serious reckoning with the mistakes we've made in ignoring the largest driver of our social and ecological crises.

The United States has the highest fertility rate of any industrialized country and, because of its high level of consumption, is a much greater contributor to climate change than developing countries with higher fertility rates. Moreover, over half of United States pregnancies are unplanned,³⁷ which shows a pressing need for family planning policy reform and increased services.

For decades, neoclassical economists have doggedly encouraged high fertility rates, all with the single-minded goal of increasing GDP. In the age of Donald Trump, their efforts took on a new overt and reactionary dimension, with a massive public persuasion campaign working around the concept of fertility rate decline as “underpopulation,” and with multiple efforts³⁸ to increase fertility rates and undo all the hard-fought victories that those declines represent. But their calculations were incomplete and shortsighted, founded on an illusion of growth unlimited by the physical world, callous to the destruction of nature and the suffering of nonhuman animals, ignorant to our sheer dependence on the health of Earth's natural systems, and compounded by a lack of concern for inequities in the distribution of short-term growth and long-term burdens.³⁹

The institutional failure to “appropriately and adequately account for and measure” the impacts of population growth likewise “threatens the competitiveness of U.S. companies and markets, the life savings and pensions of U.S. workers and families, and the ability of U.S. financial institutions to serve communities.” Nor is this failure limited to government and for-profit corporations, with major environmental and human-rights nonprofits and nongovernment organizations such as Amnesty International,⁴⁰ the Center for Reproductive Rights,⁴¹ the Center

³⁶ See

<https://fairstartmovement.org/meghan-and-harry-support-smaller-families-when-will-environmental-orgs-2/>

³⁷ L.B. Finer and M.R. Zolna, *Unintended pregnancy in the United States: incidence and disparities, 2006*, 84 *CONTRACEPTION* 478 (Nov. 2011).

³⁸ See

<http://www.alternet.org/environment/low-fertility-rates-isnt-crisis-some-argue-its-solution-safer-more-sustainable-world>

³⁹ See Ehrlich, Paul R., and Anne H. Ehrlich. "Population, Resources, and the Faith-Based Economy: the Situation in 2016." *BioPhysical Economics and Resource Quality* 1.1 (2016): 1-9 (“pro-growth proponents stubbornly refuse to recognize increasing biophysical constraints” while “also ignor[ing] the possibilities for reorganizing the economy on a more equitable basis.”)

⁴⁰ Amnesty international,

<https://www.amnesty.org/en/what-we-do/sexual-and-reproductive-rights/> (“Sexual and reproductive rights mean you should be able to make your own decisions about your body and: . . . decide if you want to have children and how many.”)

⁴¹ Center for Reproductive Rights,

http://www.reproductiverights.org/sites/crr.civicactions.net/files/documents/RRRareHR_final.pdf (listing among the twelve human rights key to reproductive rights “The Right to Decide the

for Biological Diversity,⁴² and Right for Education⁴³ adopting an “Isolation Model” of parenting in which potential parents are seen as individual entities apart from their prospective children and the communities in which they live, whereby the human rights of prospective children are not recognized, the voices of marginalized communities are not heard, and the connection between population growth and climate change is ignored under the mistaken assumption that the alternative necessarily involves some level of governmental coercion,⁴⁴ or that children can never be harmed by being born, thereby negating the broader public interests at stake.⁴⁵

The Fair Start Solution

Unlike our current failing Isolation Model, the Fair Start Movement seeks to modify the underlying norms that continue to spur unsustainable population growth, so that having children is not merely the “default option,” but accurately recognized as the most important decision of our lives.⁴⁶ In this sense, the child-centered Fair Start model supports solutions to immediate and critical problems like inequities in child welfare and diminishing democracy, as well as climate change and biodiversity loss. Climate change and its connection to population growth have been looked at primarily in terms of increased emissions, but the connection involves many more factors. What effects will population policies have on people’s resilience, levels of education, cooperativeness, etc., in a more challenging future with fewer resources? How will those policies determine people’s abilities to work together to deal with that more challenging future? Current policies sow the seeds of destabilization by promoting growing inequality in future generations. Relative to the Isolation Model, the Fair Start model seeks to actually reduce fertility rates and projected world population,⁴⁷ increase child welfare, and develop equal opportunities in life for every child.

Number and Spacing of Children”)

⁴² Center for Biological Diversity, We Stand with Black Lives Matter, available at http://action.biologicaldiversity.org/o/2167/t/0/blastContent.jsp?email_blast_KEY=1318619 (“Our Population and Sustainability Program is committed to ensuring families have the tools needed to choose when, if, and how many children they will have.”)

⁴³ Right for Education, Women Have the Right to Choose How Many Children They Want, (April 4, 2016)

<http://www.rightforeducation.org/all-topics/law-rights/women-have-the-right-to-choose-2/>) (“A woman’s body is hers and hers alone. She has the right to make decisions concerning her body, and this includes how many children she wants- if any- and when she wants them. The woman herself is the one who knows when she is physically and emotionally ready and able to bear, give birth to and care for her child. Nobody else bears or gives birth to the baby, and therefore nobody else should have the final decision on when and whether a woman should become pregnant.”)

⁴⁴ See Bayles, Michael D. "Limits to a right to procreate." *Ethics and Population* (1976): 41-55.

⁴⁵ John A. Robertson, Procreative Liberty and Harm to Offspring in Assisted Reproduction, 30 *AM J.L. & MED.* 7, 24–39 (2004)

⁴⁶ Hamity, M., Dillard, C., Bexell, S. M., & Graff-Hughey, C. (2019). A Human Rights Approach to Planning Families. *Social Change*, 49(3), 469-492.

⁴⁷ See <https://esa.un.org/unpd/wpp/Download/Standard/Population/>;
<https://esa.un.org/unpd/wpp/Download/Standard/Fertility/>; <https://esa.un.org/unpd/wpp/>

We cannot change the most important factor — a family planning system that exploits rather than collectively and significantly invests in future generations — if we do not know the truth about the historic, current, and future impacts of our family planning policies. This is especially crucial as the ecologies future generations will inhabit degrade and their need to be made especially resilient grows.

As such, we are urging you to issue an executive order, and pass aligned legislation, ensuring that the ESG disclosure framework includes disclosures related to the financial support of population growth policies. Absent such disclosures, corporate entities may continue to deceive consumers and donors with claims that a corporation has meaningfully tackled climate change when, in truth, that corporation's promotion of population growth has degraded the nonhuman world and deprived children in vulnerable communities of an ecosocial fair start in life.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Ashley Berke
Fair Start Movement